PRESERVED

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

C.V 55-29 (10, 13-15, 17) 1929-30

" 50-28 (Vol. 1-5 C.V)

File No. 55-29

Serial Nos. 1-7.

Later references.

C.V 55-29 (8-10)

PRESERVED

SHA 202-33 (1-2)

C.V. 7-33 (37, 39, 44, 46, 47, 63)

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. Index -

Part B for September 30

SUBJECT.

Passing final orders re allocation of Vety Inspectors.

N 2620-21/C 55-29-7 d 3.9.30.

Sanctions the allocation of Vety Inspectors to the Dir of Agriculture

Encls. thro JD

App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat

C/File No. 55 of 1929.

Serial No.	
1	Roc 746-C0/28 & 13/11/29 from Ind. Dir: of Agriculture — Submits allocation proposals re Inspectors of the C.C.D consequent on the reorganisation sanctioned in fo. No 9982-600'44 & 30.3.29

Subs.

1) The following are Variations in the relative ranks of Asstt. Inspectors: —

~~Present allocation Sh~~ ~~Proposed~~

a) Mr M. Sundararaja Iyengar was shown above Mr C. Govinda Rao in the Gradation List as it stood on 1-1-29. The order is reversed in the allocation Sh

b) Mr T. Venkatachellam was shown above Mr. Ramaswami Naidu in the Gradation list; the order is reversed in the allocation Sh

c) V.S. Rajagopal Mood. was shown above Mr C Ranjundaiya in the gradation; the order is reversed in the allocation Sh

d) It is also not clear why the permanent place of Mr P.S. Shama Rao was not shown at all in the Gradation list.

2) In the allocation Sh under "present pay" Mr S.R Bapu (No 8) [redacted] shown as drawing Rs 108 — This is not one of the stages in the old grade/Rs 5½

Note—Contn. Sheet

WD 066—GPB—80,000—26-7-29

General and Revenue Secretariat

App. F. III—2]

A File No. 55 of 192 9.

Serial No.

Sanctioning a time Scale for Vety. Inspectors and calling for an allocation Sl. has given occasion to ~~that~~ Special recommendations by the Supply C.D. supported by the Dir: of Agriculture.

3. It is recommended that all Vety. Inspectors drawing their present pay for over two years may be given three advance increments & those that would have been entitled to an increment in 28/29 under the old Scale be allowed one advance increment. The reasons advanced by the Supply C.D. for this generous treatment of giving three increments for two years service do not seem convincing.

4 ~~The~~ Whether the principles adopted for allocation of Posts of the Agric. ~~Dept~~ Dept. or of the Cooperative Dept may not be followed in the present Case is for orders.

5. Special recommendations made on behalf of individual Officers should perhaps form the Subjects of ~~separate~~ references.

6 The gradation list as on 1-1-29 was

Note—Contn. Sheet

WD 066—GPB—80,000—26-7-29

Serial No.

recruits from the Supdt. himself. There must have been some reason for the officers mentioned in para 1 of the note being given lower places than their services warranted. Perhaps the ~~Supdt.~~ Dir. may be asked for that reason & also why it is proposed to promote them now.

~~Secy~~ Yes please

28/11/29

Cen 29.11.29

Subd with draft for orders

29/11

Issue Cen 29.11.29

2. D. 5704/Genl ors. 30/11/29

To The Director of Agri.

Requests him to explain certain discrepancies in the S/Ts.

Secs A 10/12

3 Roc 746/W 19 & 1920-29 & 10.1.30 from the Dir: of Agriculture. Explains the discrepancies referred to.

Subd (1) The variations observed in paras 1 & 2 ~~have been~~ of the Note have been explained.

The points for orders are:—

(a) Whether Spl promotions recommended in individual cases should now be sanctioned;

(b) Whether ~~Spl in each case~~ allocation &

GEN. & REV. DEPARTMENT 10 DEC. 1929 DEVELOPMENT BRANCH

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD 066—GPB—80,000—26-7-29

Serial No.

As now sent up may be approved

Ved 18/1

11/1

The recommendations are as follows:

(1) that all the Dely. Inspectors (except those recommended for special treatment) who have been drawing their present pay for more than two years on 1.7.1928 (date of reorganisation) should be given three advanced increments.

12 These are the liberal recommendations. The principles followed in the case of other depts. may also be adopted here, viz.:-

(a) for one to four years of service (on 30.9.29) on present pay, one increment

(b) for 4 years & more of service, 2 increments

(c) for less than 1 year of service, no increment but the period during which the present pay is drawn to count for next increment — this privilege, however, not being admissible to those entitled to the concession specified in (d)

(d) when the pay plus the increment on the above basis does not form a stage of the new progressive scale, the next stage of increment in the scale to be given.

(13) (3) that the following officers be given substantial treatment:-

(i) Mr. R. M. Patankar — entered service on Rs 30, on 24-3-1908, now a 1st. grade Inspector (100-5-150)

(2) that those who would have been entitled to an increment during 1928-29 under the old scale to be given one advanced increment (i.e. apparently 2 increments)

17 I agree that this principle might be adopted VK

Note—Contn. Sheet

Serial No.

drawing Rs 100 + Rs 30 (for acting as Asst Supdt: at Mysore from 12.2.29). He is said to have got his last increment on 1-7-1921 (vide flag L), apparently in his old grade. & the Rl: Mysore. He was started on Rs 100 in the 1st: grade from 1.7.2 He is now recommended for Rs 145 in the new time scale of Rs 60-5-150, from ~~1.4.29~~ 30.3.29, as his junior Mr. C. Narayana Iyengar, who entered Service on 21-1-'09, is drawing Rs 140 in the Circs. and as, but for the two re-organ? he has been drawing Rs 140 in grade detailed in the Supdt's letter, Mr. Narayana Iyengar has been drawing Rs 140 since 7-10-1927, so 120-10-140 according to the principles suggested above, he will be entitled to get one increment raising his pay to Rs 145 from 30.3. ~~1.4.~~29. So, Mr. Patankar may also, perhaps, be given Rs 145 from 30.3. ~~1.4.~~29

187 I agree WR

(ii) Mr. N. Krishna Iyengar — entered service on 21-1-1909 on Rs 30 — now a 1st: grade Insp. on Rs 100 He is said to have got his last increment on 1.7.23 & is ~~apparently~~ drawing Rs 100 since that date. He is now recommended for Rs 125 from 30.3 ~~1.4.~~29 in the entitled only to Rs 110 view of his good work, Considering that Mr. Narayana Iyengar, who entered service on the same date as himself is drawing a much higher pay, this recommendation may, perhaps, be cancelled.

19) Number given Rs ~~110~~ 115/- WR

(iii) Mr. M. Ramaswami Naidu — entered service on 28-4-1921 on Rs 45 — 3rd. grade Insp. on Rs 72 (50-5-72) & A.S.D. in 2nd grade on Rs ~~87~~ 77 from 1-1-25. Got his last increment on 1-1-27. He is recommended for Rs 95 from 30.3 ~~1.4.~~2

Note—Contn. Sheet

WD 066—GPB—50,000—26-3-29

App. F. [III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat — G.V. File No. 55 of 1929.

Serial No.

Hough he was entitled to draw Rs 92, he ~~draws~~ is said to insist on his drawing only Rs 80 from 1.7.28. In view of the circs. explained, I submit the recommendation to give him Rs 95 from 30.3. ~~1.4.~~29 may be sanctd.

20) Member favrs Rs 90 from 1.4.29 UR

(iv) Mr C.V. Govinda Rao — entered service on ~~Rs 75~~ on Rs 75- 3-4-17 — now a 2nd. gde. Inspector (11th on list) drawing Rs 80 × 2 from 1.7.28. Got his last increment on 1-9-21, i.e. has been drawing Rs 82 since then. He is now recommended to be placed 6th on the list, which is his legitimate rank, and given a pay of Rs 105 from 30.3. ~~1.4.~~29. He was placed 11th in rank as per the gradation list flagged O, but this is apparently a mistake. His proper rank may, therefore, be allowed. According to the principle suggested above he would get Rs 95 from 30.3. ~~1.4.~~29. Whether in view of the strong recommendation of the Dept. he should be given anything more is a point for order. It may be remarked here that some of his juniors, such as, Sundararajayya (entered service on 11-12-18 on Rs 75-), C.A. Nayar etc. are drawing higher pay.

21) We recommend him to the Dist. Member 8d. UR

1.7.23 - promoted to Rs 97
13.7.26 " " 99
13.7.27 " " 100

(v) Mr. N.R. Sreenivasa Iyengar — entered service on 26-5-1913 on Rs 30- 2nd. gde. Inspector acting in the 1st. gde. on Rs 100- has been drawing Rs 120 since 13.7.27 ~~1.7.28~~. He is now recommended for Rs 125 from 30.3. ~~1.4.~~29 as his junior Mr. S.R. Bapu (entered service 4-6-18) is drawing Rs 116 from 1-6-29 in the Forest Dept. in the grade of Rs 100- 5/2-140. As this latter is a direct

Note—Contn. Sheet

WD 066—GPB—60,000—26-7-29

4322
5965

App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No. 55 of 1929.

Serial No.

22/ I don't think Mr. Srinivasachariyar should be given a higher pay on this ground. He may be given Rs 110 from 1.4.29.

appointment, it does not seem reasonable to give Mr. Srinivasa Iyengar a higher pay on the strength of this. According to the above-mentioned principles, he will get Rs 110* from 2nd grade and this appears sufficient.

14 Apart from the above, one or two minor changes are recommended in the allocation statement now sent up (Flag A), e.g. A. Ramaswami Naidu is placed above Mr. T. V. Venkatachalam as he was reduced as a punishment; Mr. T. Chandu is placed above Mr. Ramaswamy Naidu as he is senior. These changes may be sanctd.

15 The cases of Messrs C. K. Srinivasa Iyengar, Asst. Supdt., and B. Lakshminarasu, Offg. Supdt., A.A. Dept., have been reserved for separate representation

16 The question of the efficiency bar at Rs 120 has also to be considered in making the allocation

(Flag B) C.C. 8.2.30

25 I have noted my views in the margin

26 The pay on allocation might be fixed on the same principles as were adopted in the Conservancy & Agri Depts. The principles are enumerated in the office note.

27 In regard to the spl cases, I have indicated the pay which I think may be allowed.

2nd Member through H. de S. 13.2.30

C.C. 13.2.30

28 The Committee may be requested to verify and report the Members pay as fixed with under the orders

* This is a mistake. He is entitled only to Rs 105 as he was drawing Rs 105 from 13.7.27 & not from 1.7.23. C.C. 6/7/30

23/ Yes

20/ We may take it that in making the recommendations, the Dr has had regard to this

10605/17

R 2241

R 14/2/30

Note—Contin. Sheet

WD 066—GPB—80,000—26-7-29

5765

Pp. F. III—21

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No. | of 192

Serial No. 29.

Please put up the case of the other two officers recommended. Also, there is the name of Mr. [illegible] 20.2.30

4 Roc 746-CU 198/28-29 & 10.1.30 from the Dy: Y Agri. Proposes that both Messrs B. Lakshmipathy Offg Supdg A.M.O/Hqrs C. K. Srinivasa Ayengar may be graded as Asstt Supdgs and given Rs 200 in grade Rs 150-10-200-

Subd 30 with refce to para 29 of the Rules above

Date 29/2 [signature]

31 Before sending the file to the Compt: as required by the Hl. Govt in para 28, we may consider the case of the two remaining Officers also in respect of whom recommendations have since been received:-

Mr. B. Lakshmipathi Naidu — entered service on 20.2.1911. In the allocation ordered in the G.O. of 26.9.28 (R) he was placed 7th among the 2nd grade Inspectors on Rs 80-4-100 with a pay of Rs 80 + 2. He is now recommended to be promoted as an Asstt Supdt. on Rs 200 & placed next to Mr. K. Krishnaiengar in view of his great ability. He is at present officiating as A.M. Supdt. on Rs ~~250~~ 275 from 18.8.28. There is no vacancy at present in the grade of Asstt. Supdts. If the recommendation is to be carried, he will have to be treated as a supernumerary as in the case of Mr. T. V. Manickaraj, or he may be appointed in the vacancy of Mr. Swami Rao who retires in April.

Mr. C. K. Srinivasaiengar — entered service on 6.5.07

Note—Contn. Sheet

WD. 066—GPB—80,000—26-7-29

Serial No.

In the last allocation he was placed 4th on the list of Asst. Supdts on Rs 150 in the grade of Rs 150-10-200. He is now drawing Rs 160. He is recommended for Rs 200 from 17.29, and to be placed next only to Mr. Lakshmipathi. He is said to have been appointed Asst. Supdt. in 1918 & to have drawn one increment before he reverted to the Kenigal Stud Farm. If he had not been disturbed, thereby, he would have been the senior most of Asst. Supdts drawing Rs 200. He was, however, not given this rank on his reversion to the C.V.O. as he had lost touch with the work for 8 years. Now he has now picked up the work & given satisfaction he is recommended to be given his legitimate place. I think this may be agreed.

Secy 8)

12.3.30

32 I would not mix up these Spl Cases with the general question. They may be separately considered.

The Complete verification may be obtd

Dr 3 30.

33 Forwarded with compliments to the Comptroller for favour of verification as required by the Financial Secretary in Para 2.

B.O

Chairman

For Development Secy

21.3.30.

COMPTROLLER'S OFFICE
27 MAR 1930
4938
BANGALORE.

Note:—Contin. sheet.

WD 066—GPB—80,000—26-7-29

No 1881 Pt
W.A. 10 mic

WD 01229—GPB—37,500—1-9-26
App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No | of 192 .

Serial No.

U.O.No.841 WAD Mis dated 13th May 1930.

Returned with compliments.

2. The allocation of the Veterinary Staff relating to the Agricultural and Forest Departments has been duly verified with the following observations:-

(1) Mr.B.Lakshmipathi Naidu:- Entered service on 20th February 1911 and not on 2nd February 1911 as noted in the statement. His substantive appointment is that of Veterinary Assistant in grade 80-4-100. He was appointed as Manager temporary "Palace Diary Farm" with effect from 1st August 192 and was drawing a salary of Rs250/- per mensem and i Government Order No.13604-6/A&E 332-27-2 dated 28th June 1928 he was appointed officiating Superintende Amrit Mahal Department, on Rs275/- per mensem with effect from 18th August 1928. Since he is now propo ed to be promoted to the grade of Assistant Superin tendent, Civil Veterinary Department, in grade 150-10 200 he has to be stated on Rs150/- per mensem, the minimum pay of the appointment under Article 84 (b) M.S.R. as his substantive pay is less than the min mum pay of the new appointment.

(2) Mr.C.K.Sreenivasa Iyengar. Entered servic on 6th May 1907 and was appointed Assistant Super tendent, Civil Veterinary Department, with effect from 12th July 1928 on Rs150/- per mensem in grade 150-10-200. He is now drawing Rs160/- per mensem f 12th July 1929. There are no rules in M.S.R. to him

NOTE- Contn.Sheet

Serial No.

him R$200/- from 1st July 1929.

(3) The present pay of the following Veterinary Inspectors are as noted below and not as noted in the allocation statement.

Mr.C. Ranganna	...	R$97/-
Mr.M.K.Kenchaiah	...	R$72/-
Mr.T.V.Venkatachelam	..	R$72/-
Mr.C.S.Prabhakar	...	R$72/-
Mr.H.B.Kalakarni	...	R$72/-
Mr.P.K.Shama Rao	...	R$72/-
Mr.K.N.Kailasam	...	R$72/-
Mr.B. Sheik Peer	...	R$72/-

(4) Mr. S.R.Bapu, is the Veterinary Officer in charge of Elephants -Forest Department- temporary. He is drawing R$116/- from 1st June 1929 in grade 100-8-140.

(5) The portion of the Veterinary Staff relating to the Military Department has been verified by the Financial Assistant to the Chief Commandant Mysore State Troops.

Comptroller.

MSR Subs with draft as per Sec's personal instructions

40 opr: for approval

Issue

Note Contn.Sheet

28 APR. 1930

5982

46121

Serial No.

U.O.No.714/WAD Misc. dated 14-4-1930.

Forwarded with compliments to the Financial Assistant to the Chief Commandant, Mysore State Troops, Bangalore. The portion of the Veterinary staff relating to the Military Department may be kindly verified and the file retransmitted at an early date.

B.A Narayana Rao
Asst. Comptroller.

U.O.No.4295 25-4-30 Encs

Returned with Compliments.

43 The present pay of the several Veterinary Inspectors, working in the Military Department is noted below:-

Mr.B.V.Venkatachar, acting Assistant Superintendent attached to Mysore Lancers.	Rs.140/- plus an acting allowance of Rs.20/-.
Mr.V.Jagannath, attached to Mysore Horse.	Rs.75/-
Mr.Mahomed Davood attached to Kunigal	Rs.60/- temporary.

44 The pay of the Inspectors previously working in the Military Department and shown in the column of present pay of the allocation statement is also verified and found correct.

K.Narayan 24/4/30
Financial Assistant to Chief Commandant, Mysore State Troops.

P.2.0

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD 066—GPB—80,000—26-7-29

5980
10992

App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat | C V. File No. 55 of 1929.

Serial No.

5. D. 13000/ dated 23/5/30.
To The director of Agri.
Returns the allocation stt. and requests him to submit a revised stt in accordance with the principles detailed therein.

Sus A

6 Roc 746 Est/28.29 & 21/6/30 from the Director of Agriculture. Submits revised allocation proposals.

Subd 45 Letter to the Director of Agriculture No 18507/G 10.6.30 from the Supdt. C.V.D explains the necessity for the grant of special increments to Messrs N.R. Srinivasaiyangar, C. Ranganna, M. Sundararajaiengar, C.V. Govinda Rao, M. Ramaswami Naidu, M.R. Kenchia & T. Chandra

Subd 46 Please verify whether, apart from the 26 exceptions, the pay proposed is in accordance with the principles laid down

Subd 47 The Stt has been Verified Ca 30/6 on the assumption that the allocation will be given effect to from 30.3.29.

Flag V

48) Further information has perhaps to be called for on the following points:-

49) No 18, 1921 in the list. Pay as it stood on 1.3.29 is reported Rs 80; but "present pay" is reported to be Rs 72/- from 30.3.29.

Subdi also means that from the date of the G.O. of 30.3.29 the Compr. admissible only to the substantive pay of the individuals as on 1.4.29. arrangements were admissible, all the 3 old grades having been combined in one.

Ca 8/7

Note—Contn. Sheet

WD 02328—GPB—10,000—22-4-30

Serial No.

~~Vide Paper~~

57) S. Kalyanasundaram

Mr ~~S. Subbaraya~~ (No 35) is said to be drawing Rs 6 ~~Rs 6~~ from 1.7.28 and Rs 75 is recommended for him. Whether the reason assigned for a Spl. treatment to this Offr. is convincing is for ord

57) Another point also arises for consideration. The pay of No. 42 is reported to be Rs 67 from 1.7.28. This does not form a Stage in the grade Rs 60-5-150. It is for orders whether he should not be given Rs 70 in the grade. Why he is recommended for Rs 75 Sp. is not clear.

vide para 52(11) below

58) Lastly the pay proposed in the Cases of Messrs K.S. Gopalarao, H.N. Dorasami Iyengar N. Seshagiri Rao & K.J. Subramanyam are not according to the principles enunciated

vide Paras. 47 & 50 above

~~For~~ 53) Each of them is reported to be getting Rs 60 from 1.7.28. Their pay should therefore be Rs 60 on 30.3.29 and should be allowed to draw Rs 65 from 1.7.29. No reasons are assigned also why they are recommended for Rs 70 from 30.3.29.

524 (13) below

~~Col VII~~ 54) The following Offrs are recommended for special treatment:—

(1) Mr. K.R. Srinivasa Iyengar

Please see page 6 (v) of notes. In addition to the reason given there for starting him on Rs 180 from 20.6.29 when he is entitled to only Rs 165, it is now stated that two orders of his juniors, viz. Messrs G. Subramanian and V. Thallam Iyengar

Note—Contn. Sheet

G.T. File No 55 of 1929

General and Revenue Secretariat

Serial No.

will also get more pay when he does. The relative position of these three officers is as follows:-

	Date of entry into service	Pay	Date of confirmation	Pay	Present pay	By subsidiary 30.3. & from 1.4.29
Mr. N.R.S.	26.5.1913	30	1914	30	100 from 13.7.27 (in grade 97-2-100)	105 in grade 60-5-120
" G.S.	30.3.1914	30	4.5.15	30	97 " 1.7.23 (in grade 72-5-97)	110 — do —
" L.V.S.	17.9.1914	30	16.9.20	75	97 " 1.7.24 (— do —)	110 — do —

From the above it will be seen that Mr. N.R.S. reached the max. of the old 1st. grade on 3.7.27 while the two others were still in the 2nd. grad, he will now draw less than them. He may, therefore, be started on Rs 115 or at least on Rs 110.

I think he may be started on Rs 115

2) Mr. C. Ranganna:- His service is as follows:-

25.8.1916 - 30 - 25.8.16 - 30 — 97 from 1.7.25 — 105 — do —

He has been recommended for Rs 110 because his junior Mr. M. Sundaraja Iyengar (see below) will be drawing this pay. The latter was started on a high pay ~~this pay~~. But it ~~will be seen that he entered~~ and also reached Rs 97 one year earlier, while he entered ~~service~~ 2 years after they drew & reached Rs 97 also ~~service about~~ over 3 years later. In the circs., perhaps, ~~later. There seems to be no reason, therefore, to~~ the recommendation may be approved. ~~just how or a fact with them.~~

Recommended Rs 110/-

3) Mr. M. Sundaraja Iyengar :- His service is as follows:-

11.12.1919 — 75 — 11.12.19 - 75 — 97 from 1.7.24 — 110 — do —

3) Mr. C.V. Govinda Rao - (see page 6 (10))

This officer entered service in the Mysore Service on Rs 75 on 3.4.17 & was later transferred to the C.V.D. He has been drawing Rs 82 from 1.9.21 & is entitled to Rs 95 from ~~1.4.~~ 30.3. 29. He has been recommended for Rs 110. This may, perhaps, be allowed as his junior, Mr. M. Sundaraja Iyengar, will also get this pay. He is

Recommended Rs 110/- (This is in supersession of my recommendation on p. 6)

Note–Contn. Sheet

Serial No.

This seems to have been a real hard case

said to have suffered seriously by being transferred from the Mahiskey dept. just when the pay of the post he was holding was raised to Rs 100-10-150.

(4) Mr. M. Ramaswami Naidu :- (see page 5 (iii))

The details now given of his service are as follows :-

Date of entry into service	Pay	Date of Confirmn	Pay	Present pay	Pay sanctioned from 30.3.29
28.4.21	40 -	26.4.23 -	62 -	72 (from 26.4.25) (Sr. gde - 50-5-72)	80

He is said to have been s.f.t. II grade (72-6-84) on Rs 77 from 1.1.28 but his pay in the higher grade was disallowed from 30.3.29. In the absence of the two re-organisations he would have drawn Rs 92. He is, therefore, recommended for Rs 95, but the Dy. Secy. has suggested Rs 90. (page 5)

I think (in modification of my previous views) that he might be given Rs 95/-

(5) Mr. R. M. Sakankar - (see page 4 (i))

Please see my notes on p 5.

(6) Mr. N. Krishnaswamy - (" " 5 ii)

(7) " N. Krishnamurthi (No. 17 in alleged absentees)

Has been recommended for Rs 100 Rs' entitled to only Rs 95. His increment is said to have been stopped by the placed below Mr. K. Ranganatha Rao in rank in Director's letter No. D, dis 118 & 9.1.28. The recommendation to give him Rs 100 may, perhaps, be approved.

Yes

(8) Mr. M. R. Kenchiah - (No. 18) recommended for Rs 95 Rs' entitled to only Rs 80. He was reduced from Rs 80 to Rs 75 in Dirs. No. 829 & 8.12.21 & again from Rs 75 to Rs 72 from 28.4.24. He would have drawn

I agree (Rs 95/-)

Note—Contn. Sheet

WD 02328—GPB—10,000—22-4-30

Serial No.

it is said, Rs 87 but for the two reorganisations. As he has already suffered a good deal & would have been entitled to Rs 110 but for his premature retirement the recommendation to grant him Rs 95 may be approved.

(9) Mr. T. Chandra (No. 19) - Was recommended for Rs 95 tho' entitled to only Rs 85 as he would have drawn Rs 92 in the absence of the two re-orgn. This may, perhaps, be approved

(10) Mr. T. V. Venkatachalam (No. 21) - Recommended for Rs 90 tho' entitled only to Rs 85. Was reduced two stages & one increment stopped on 1.7.23. He should have drawn Rs 92 in the absence of the two re-organisations. Recommendation may be approved

Yes

(11) Nos. 22 to 30 have been recommended for Rs 85 when they are entitled to only Rs 80; so also in the cases of Nos. 42 to 65 (Cases 47 to 50) all of whom have been recommended for one more increment. Major Lumpkin told me that this was done because otherwise men with a difference of from 1 to 3 years in their respective services would get the same pay. But it does not seem advisable to recognise such distinctions, as the date of confirmation vary to a great extent & it is not possible to draw the line with any degree of fairness

Yes

Keep to stages on Rs 80/-

2) No. 35 who is entitled to Rs 60 has been

Note—Contn. Sheet

General and Revenue Secretariat — File No. 55- of 1929.

Serial No.

Re-organisation of the C.V.D.

recommended for Rs 75 as his confirmation was delayed to provide for Olympiad. This, I think, cannot be accepted.

(13) In the cases of Nos. 47 to 50, they would have drawn Rs 62 in the absence of the last reorgn. Now they are entitled only to Rs 60. They may, perhaps, be given Rs 66.

55. As regards the extra cost entailed by this reorgn., the Dir. may be asked if he could suggest any retrenchment.

Lay S)

Ce 8/7/30

56 Please put up an allocation statement, following notes in margin, and note what the extra cost will be.

12/7/30

Ce 12/7

57 Subd with an allocation Statement. The Extra Cost will come up to Rs 415 a month or Rs 4980 a year.

58 Please also see add note against (13) above.

17/7 Lay S)

Ce 17.7.30

59 If the allocation proposed by me is agreed, the Dir will be asked if he could support a reappn for meeting the extra cost this year.

2d Member (through FC 18/7)

19/7/30

19/7/30

Note—Contn. Sheet

WD 02328—GPB—10,000—22-4-30

Rs 60/-

This man may be given Rs 65— as I find other Rs. Rs. have got Rs 66 in the absence of the last reorgn. This has not been taken into the allocation. Ce 17/7/30

I agree 19/7/30

I agree

Serial No.

60 The reorganisation of the Civil Veterinary Department with 3 grades of Veterinary Inspectors was sanctioned in January 1928. This was given effect to from 1st July 1928 and the allocation of the offices of the Department in the re-organised scale was also approved in an order dated 26th September 1928.

61 In regard to fixing the starting pay of the several officers in the revised grades Government directed that they should start on the pay strictly admissible under the provisions of the M.S.R.

62 In the Government Order of 30th March 1929, the 3 grades 60-4-80, 80-4-100 and 100-10-150 were all merged into one uniform time scale of 60-5-150 with an efficiency bar at Rs 120/-.

63 In sanctioning this revision Government expressly stated that the starting pay of the incumbents should be fixed in strict accordance with the M.S.R.

64 In the circumstances above stated, I do not think that the question of giving advance increments to any officer really arises. There appears to be no need to go behind the allocation statement published with the Government Order of 26th September 1928.

65 All that is required is that the pay of

Note–Contn. Sheet

Serial No.

the Officers should be fixed ~~in~~ in the new time scale after making allowances for any changes that have become necessary since the last allocation order which has effect from 1st July 1928.

66 If any higher pay than what is admissible under the rules is proposed to be given to any Officer or officers as a concession to remedy stagnation, hardship such proposals should form the subject matter of a separate reference for consideration on the merits. - Vide Second Member's Orders dated 18th August 1928.-

67 Agree with Fl Secy

68 A statement showing the pay of the Insp^rs strictly admissible under the provisions of the M.S.R. is submitted

69 Secy (S)

70 Dupty S.O. according to Fin. note & sanctioning allocation as per statement now prepared

71 Submitted with Draft

Note—Contn. Sheet

WD 02328—GPB—10,000—22-4-30

C.V File No 55 of 1929

General and Revenue Secretariat

Serial No.

72 Opt. for approval
Keys

Ce 22/8/30

OFFICE OF THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL
28 AUG. 1930
No. 1748

73 Secd Member.

Bn 26/8
Ce 26/8

74 CSX 29/8. Bn 30/8

75 Issue Ce 30/8

76 Sno C1. Ce is according to financial Sec's Note (Vide previous page). Draft again desc. Done AD/Bn 78

R. Cen. 510 dt 29/8/30

B.S.W. 29

D. 2120-21/ dated 3/9/30 To The Director of Agrs" " Comptroller Accs TD. Passes orders on the allocation of the Secy. Inspectors in the new Time scale with effect from 30-3-29

77 communicated

7

B 2.9.30 8 19

GEN. & REV. SECRETARIAT
8 SEP. 1930
DEVELOPMENT BRANCH.

Note–Contn. Sheet

C. O. 30 Gl.]

COMPTROLLER'S OFFICE,
CIVIL BRANCH.

SECTION ( )

Sectional Diary No. of letter replied to.....

General ,, ,, ...

Whether a reminder is necessary on this letter, and if so, date on which it may issue or be repeated

(*To be entered by the Superintendent of the Drafting Section under his initials*)

.....

.....

No. and date of reminders, if issued

1.....

2.....

3.....

C. O. 17 Gl. 17]

FILE ORDER.

CASE No.

SERIAL No.

~~No. Enclosures.~~

Date ~~of issue~~.....

Subject.—

To

The present pay of the several Veterinary Inspectors pertaining to T.A.D.(B) portion have been verified ~~d~~ with the following observation. The present pay of the following Veterinary Inspectors are as noted below and not as noted in the allocation statement received from the Director of Agriculture received in his letter No. R.O.C.746 - C.V./198 of 28-29 dated 10/1/1930

Mr. B. Ranganna = Rs.97-.-.
Mr. M. R. Kenchiah = Rs.72-.-.
" T.V. Venkatachalam = Rs.72-.-.
" C. S. Prabhakar = Rs.72-.-.
" H.B. Kulkarni = Rs.72-.-.
" P. K. Shama Rao = Rs.72-.-.
" K.N. Kailasam = Rs.72-.-.
" B. Sheikh peer = Rs.72-.-.

Proceed on to G.A.D. and Forest for Verification and despatch. The portion to be dealt by Military has to be verified by the Deptl. And to ce

G. 5.4.30

(P.T.O)

The portion relating to G.A.D.
has been verified with the following
observation and passed on to
Forest Section for further action.

1) Mr. B. Lakshmipathy Naicker
entered ~~the~~ Service on 20th February
1911 as against 2nd February 1911 noted
in the file. His substantive ~~pay~~
appointment is that of a Vety. asst.
in grade 80-4-100. He was appointed
as manager, ~~temporary~~, palace dairy
farm, with effect from 1st May 1921
& was drawing a Salary of Rs 254 p.m.,
and in GO no 13604-6 dt 28-6-28
A & E 332-27-2.
he was appointed ~~as was appointed~~
officiating Supdt. Amrutmahal Dept.
on Rs 275/- p.m. with effect from
18th Aug. 28. Since he is now proposed to
be promoted to the grade of Asst. Supdt.
C.V. Dept. in grade 150-10-200, he
has to be started on Rs 150/- p.m.
The minimum pay of the appointment,
under ~~the~~ 84 (a) M.S.R as his substantive
pay, is less than the minimum pay of the
new appointment.

2). Mr. C.R. Srinivasaiyar entered the
Service on 6th May 1907 and was appointed
asst. Supdt. C.V. Dept., permanent
with effect from 12th July 28 on Rs 154/- p.m.
in grade 150-10-200. He is now drawing
Rs 164/- p.m. in M.S.R from 12th July 1929. There
are no rules to give him Rs 2/- p.m.
from 1st July 1929

Copied by

Examined by

8/4/30. Forest Section

Mr. S. R Bapu is the Vety officer in
charge of Elephants - Temporary - drawing Rs
116/- from 1-6-1929 in grade 100-8-140 sanctioned
for the forest department

9/4/30

COM11J-6,000-25.1.30

G.R.S. III—3]

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

Reference is invited to para 4 of G.O. no. D 9982-10044/C.V. 50-28-5 D 30th March 1929 (modifying the scales of pay sanctioned in G.O. D 26.9.29 sanctioning a time Scale for the Inspectors in the Veterinary Deptt. According to it, the revised scale of pay takes effect from 30.3.29 the starting pay of the incumbents being fixed in strict accordance with the M.S.R.

From the notes in the file & the letter of the Director of Agriculture, it is seen that general 2 increments are proposed in the case of Inspectors who have drawn the same pay for four years or more & one increment ~~for~~ for those who have drawn the same pay for one to 4 years. There are also a few Special Cases—

The extra cost per annum as per scale fixed in the Dir: Secy's note amounts to Rs 415 a month or Rs 4980 a year.

There is no provision in the Budget to meet this extra cost. The amount that may be required this year will not be Rs 4980/ but will be much more, as the

N.B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

S.K.S. III—3]

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

Inspectors will earn increment on 30th March 1930 (after 1 year from 30.3.1929) & this will entail an additional charge -

Submd.

The points upon which observed viz (on working) allowing him a double increment in the ground of his having put in one to 4 years & more than four years' service on the same pay respectively contravene the specific direction in para 4 of G.O. of 30.3.29 of the proposals are ||

Provision has to be found not merely in the sum of Rs 4980 for annual expenditure already but also Current increments which have fallen due since 30th March 1929 & which have not been provided for in the Budget Estimates of the year. Savings and funds cannot be found by re-appropriation, as a large amount will have to be found for which the Revenue Budget as it stands at present is ill-equipped

Submd. with the pay noted in the statement.

Please note the pay admissible according this direction in the G.O. in red ink against each officer

23.7.30.

N.B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

598

C.V. 55 - 29.4

G. R. S. III—3]

ROUTINE NOTES.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

No Roc 746-C0198/28-29. dt 10/1/30
from the Director of Agriculture
Proposed that both Messrs
B. Lakshminarayana offg Supdt A.H. Dept
& C.K Srinivasa Iyengar may
be graded as Asstt Supdts and
fixed Rs 200 in grade Rs 150-10-200.
Subd the allocation proposals
have been subd to Govt. This
will if appd be placed in the
Connected file (D 5965 Secl 3/2) for
Govt orders
8/2

Read in continuation
Very 9

Clk
10/2/30

How has the matter been.
What does the Supdt C.V.D mean
by saying due consideration was
not shown to these officers?
What place were they entitled
to, & what place did they get?
The whole case has to be
examined in the orders of Govt

20 2 30.

N. B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

Govt to transmit
27/2

Plase put up with the order
file when recd. to the branch

Clk
28/2

Subd the main file (D 5965) was
subd to the Secl on 18/2 — Its receipt will
be awaited if appd — yes
Govt 27/2

C.V. allocation 84

prepared as per orders in para 56 of the Instrs

CVS 5-29

G.R.S. III—3]

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

	Present pay.	Pay proposed by SEC	Pay as admissible under the M.S.R.
B. Venkatachar	—	145 ✓	140
R. M. Patankar	Rs 100 —		100
~~N. Krishnaiengar~~			
C. Narayana Iyengar	Rs 140 ✓	145 ✓	140
N. Krishnamurthy	100 ✓	115 ✓	100
S.D. Achar	(150) × 100+50 allce	—	100
Vacant	×	×	
" N.R. Srinivasa Iyengar.	100.	115 ✓	100
" S.R. Bapu	(108-8-140) working in the Front Office	×	(115 + Grade Pay)
" S. Subrahmanya Iyer	97	110 ✓	95+2
" L.V. Sheshan Iyengar	97 — —	110 ✓	95+2
" C.V. Govindarao	82 — —	110 ✓	80+2
12. " C. Rangana	97 — —	110 ✓	95+2
13 " M. Sundararaja Iyengar	97 — —	110 ✓	95+2
14 " B. Lakshmipathy	82	—	80+2
15 " P.U. Nayar	92	—	90+2
16 " K. Ranganatharao.	86+1	—	85+2
17 " N. Krishnamurthy	87	100.	85+2
18 " M.R. Kenchaiya	72/80 — —	95	70+2
19 " T. Chandra	72/80 — —	95	70+2
20 " M. Ramaswami Naidu	72/87 SPT —	95	70+2
21 " T.V. Venkatachalam	72	90	70+2
22. C.S. Prabhakar	72	80	70+2
23 R.B. Kulkarni	72	80	70+2
P.K. Shamarao	72	80	70+2
	1582	1785	

N.B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

G.R.S.—III—3] B2 1532 | B7 1785

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

5	K. N. Kailasam	72	80	70+2
6	B. Sheik Peer	72	80	70+2
7	T. Aswatha Sastri	72	80	70+2
8	P. S. Ramarao	72 (temporary)	80	80
9	G. V. Ramaiya	72	80	70+2
10	C. Ranjmudaniyar	72	80	70+2
11	V. S. Rajagopal Moodi	72	80	70+2
12	G. Varagunamurthi	72	80	70+2
13	K. Srikantaiah	72	80	70+2
31	B. Jagannatha	72	80	70+2
35	S. Kalyanasundaram	60	65	60
36	M. Subbarao	67	75	65+2
37	K. Venkatesiah	67	75	65+2
38	B. Somasundarapillay	67	75	65+2
39	M. Srikantiah	67	75	65+2
40	Syed Nuruddin	67	75	65+2
41	K. Krishnamurti	67	75	65+2

N.B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

C2 2722

3100

C2 [illegible]

G.R.S. III—3] 82 2122 87 3100

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

42. N. Narayanadas	67	70.	65+2
43 P. C. Adikalam	67	70	65+2
44 V. S. Kuppusami Mudr	67	70	65+2
45 R. S Purshottam Nayak	67	70	65+2
46 K R Ramachandrarao	62	65	60+2
47 K. S Gopalarao	60	65	60
48 H N. Dorasami Iyengar	60	65	60
49 N. Seshagiri Rao	60	65	60
50 K. J. Subramanya	60	65	60
51 J. K. Iyengar	60	60	60
52 S.M. Pantambekar	60	60	60
53 Syed Masum	60	60	60
54 S.M. Abdul Hakim	60	60	60
55 Syed Yusuff	60	60	60
56 G. Z. Zhekariah	60	60	60
57 D. N. Vasudeva Modaliar	60	60	60
58 S. Parthasarathy	60	60	60
59 S. N. Srikantiah	60	60	60
60 J. P. Wesley	60	60	60
61 S Ramakrishna	60	60	60
62 L. Gurunathan	60	60	60

C7 4025 C7 4025

N.B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on, this form.

G.R.S. III—3]

B 2 40 2

Routine Notes.

C 2 4 4 5

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

63 N Bandrah	60	60	60
64 R. Sadagopa Ramanujam	60	60	60
65 P.K. Nair	60	60	60
	4190	4605	

Extra Cost Rs 415 a month
or Rs 4980 a year

Work
17/7

N.B.—Should Routine Notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

C.V. 55-29-1

Telegraphic Address "Agri., Bangalore."
Code-5th Edition A. B. C.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
MYSORE STATE.

In reply please quote in full the Nos. and indicative symbol given below.
No. C. 746-C. V. 198/28-29

BANGALORE,
13th November 1929

FROM

LESLIE C. COLEMAN, ESQ., M.A., PH.D.,
DIRECTOR OF AGRICULTURE IN MYSORE,
BANGALORE.

REV. SECRETARIAT 4322 6 NOV 1929 DEVELOPMENT BRANCH

To.

N. Rama Rao, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
Development Departments, Bangalore.

SIR,

In forwarding herewith copy of letter No.5999 of 6-11-29 from the Superintendent, Civil Veterinary Department, I have the honour to state that the two orders of reorganization viz., D.3714-16-C.V.65-26-17 & D.9982-10044/C.V.50-28-5 of the 20th September 1928 and 30-3-29 respectively while they have undoubtedly improved the conditions of the Veterinary Inspectors have led to certain individual hardships which I feel should be rectified. These have been explained by the Superintendent in his letter. I have the honour to request you to place before Government this representation for their sympathetic consideration. Major Simpson has left out of consideration the cases of Messrs. C.K.Srinivase Iyengar, and B. Lakshmipathi which will be sent up separately.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant.

Leslie C. Coleman

Director of Agriculture.

13.11.29

SVR.

Copy of letter No.5939 dated 6th November 1929 from Major. Simpson, M.C., C.B.V.C., Superintendent, Mysore Civil Veterinary Department, to the Director of Agriculture in Mysore, Bangalore.

I have the honour to represent that Government Order No.D.3714-16-C.V.65-23-17 dated 26th September. 1928 placed most of the Veterinary Inspectors with over two years' service in very unfavourable positions, in that it did not allow an increase of pay to those Inspectors who had been drawing the maximum pay of their grade for years, and in the cases of several others, no allowance was made for those who had, or were about to earn increments under the old scale of pay. These latter having thus to forfeit their increments under the M.S.R. rules.

Further they had another set back when Government Or-der No. D.9932-1044/C.V.-50-28-5 dated 30th March 1928, was issued for the further reorganisation of the Department, by which they again had to forfeit a second increment which they were just about to receive under the first reorganisation.

Some of the Inspectors at top of the 3rd grade, such as M.R. Kenchaiya, Mr. Ramaswami Naidu, & T. Chandu fared even worse. These Inspectors who had been acting in the next higher grade for some years and had earned several increments, had, by the M.S.Rules, to revert to the minimum pay of their new grade.

In consideration of the above facts and also that the Veterinary Inspectors have lost considerably in their daily travelling allowances as well since the first reorganisation came into effect, and also taking into consideration the very hard work they have been carrying out under the most trying conditions during the last four years in dealing with rinderpest in the State, I beg to request that Government may be asked to kindly consider their cases accordingly and recompense them xxx equitably and leverally. I, therefore, submit that all the Veterinary Inspectors who had been drawing their present pay for more than two years on the 1st of July 1928 be given three advanced increments; and those that would have been entitled to an increment during xxx 1928-29 under the old scale be

be given one advanced increment, with the following exceptions who should be treated more generously:-

1. Mr. R.M. Patankar, 1st Grade Veterinary Inspector
2. Mr. N. Krishna Iyengar, 1st grade Veterinary Inspector
3. Mr. M. Ramaswamy Naidu, 2nd grade ~~Veterinary~~ Inspector
4. Mr. C. Govinda Rao, 2nd grade Veterinary Inspector
5. Mr. M.R. Kenchaiya.

Mr. R.M. Patankar, 1st grade Veterinary Inspector, has suffered through the interests of the service having been kept in view,. While Mr. Patankar was Veterinary Inspector at Hassan, rinderpest became very bad there, and it was found necessary to draft a number of young inexperienced men into the District. These men required personal direction and supervision, and as Mr. Patankar was familiar with the local conditions, he was placed in charge of the staff working in the Hassan District. At this time an acting vacancy occured in the Mysore Hospital for which Mr. C. Narayana Iyengar, Veterinary Inspector, Tumkur, was selected. When conditions improved in the Hassan District, and the acting appointment of Veterinary Officer, Bangalore, fell vacant, Mr. Patankar was appointed and held the post for about eight months. As it was inadvisable, with rinderpest in Mysore area, to make a change at Mysore, Mr. C. Narayana Iyengar was allowed to continue in charge there. Besides, Mr. Patankar was the only officer who besides Mr. Achar, had had experience in the preparation of Virus, and as it was being contemplated to depute Mr. S.D.Achar to Muktesar, Mr. Patankar was in consequence kept in reserve for the virus work, which he took charge of later, but the strenuous work of the previous two years had undermined his health and he was obliged to take long leave.

Mr. C. Narayana Iyengar continued in uninterrupted S.P.T. charge as Veterinary Officer, Mysore, and so earned the necessary increments, which brought his pay up to Rs.140/- on the 1st July 1928 in the grade of 100-5-150 in the first reorganisation of the Department.

Mr. Patankar now justly prays that he should be placed on an equal footing with Mr. C.Narayana Iyengar on Rs.140/- from 1st July 1928. I strongly recommend that Government be kindly moved to grant

Copy of letter No.5999 dated 6th November 1929 from Major. Simpson, M.C., C.B.V.C., Superintendent, Mysore Civil Veterinary Department, to the Director of Agriculture in Mysore, Bangalore.

I have the honour to represent that Government Order No.D.3714-16-C.V.65-26-17 dated 26th September. 1928 placed most of the Veterinary Inspectors with over two years' service in very unfavourable positions, in that it did not allow an increase of pay to those Inspectors who had been drawing the maximum pay of their grade for years, and in the cases of several others, no allowance was made for those who had, or were about to earn increments under the old scale of pay. These latter having thus to forfeit their increments under the M.S.R. rules.

Further they had another set back when Government Or-der No. D.9982-1044/C.V.-50-28-5 dated 30th March 1928, was issued for the further reorganisation of the Department, by which they again had to forfeit a second increment which they were just about to receive under the first reorganisation.

Some of the Inspectors at top of the 3rd grade, such as M.R. Kenchaiya, Mr. Ramaswami Naidu, & T. Chandu fared even worse. These Inspectors who had been acting in the next higher grade for some years and had earned several increments, had, by the M.S.Rules, to revert to the minimum pay of their new grade.

In consideration of the above facts and also that the Veterinary Inspectors have lost considerably in their daily travelling allowances as well since the first reorganisation came into effect, and also taking into consideration the very hard work they have been carrying out under the most trying conditions during the last four years in dealing with rinderpest in the State, I beg to request that Government may be asked to kindly consider their cases accordingly and recompense them xxx equitably and leberally. I, therefore, submit that all the Veterinary Inspectors who had been drawing their present pay for more than two years on the 1st of July 1928 be given three advanced increments; and those that would have been entitled to an increment during xxx 1928-29 under the old scale be

grant Mr. Patankar Rs.145/- with effect from 1st April 1929. as his interests were sacrificed in the interests of the service and it would be very hard on the officer to suffer any xxx further consequences.

Mr. N. Krishna Iyengar, 1st Grade Inspector, with 20 years service, is to get only Rs.100/- per mensem, so it will be ten years before he can reach the maximum pay of his appointment. He is one of the few that had to face many hardships during the early years of his service, when there was only one Inspector for a District. Mr. Krishna Iyengar has for the past four years done exceptionally good work, and in xxxxxxxxxxxxxx consequence of his hard work under trying conditions, his health has been considerably undermined. As a very special case, I recommend that he should be given at least Rs.125/- which he richly deserves.

Mr. C. Govinda Rao, 2nd grade Inspector, although he was shown at the head of the 2nd grade Inspectors in the old gradation statement sent with the Superintendent's No.19763 dated 14th March 1927, has been placed 11th on the list of 2nd grade Inspectors . He was entertained in the service in 1917 on Rs.75/- per mensem as Veterinary Officer, Mysore Horse, and has been xxxxxxxxx - practically on the same pay ever since. To make matters worse, he was transfered to the Civil Veterinary Department just after Government had sanctioned the scale of pay of the Veterinary Officer, Mysore Horse, ~~he was~~ raised to Rs.100-10-150, thus he was deprived of this increase after years of service. Since his transfer to the Civil Veterinary Department, he has proved himself an officer of exceptionally ability, xxxxxx thorough in his work, and exceptional tact in dealing with the ryots and overcoming opposition to inoculation. He has the making of a good adminstrative officer and should be given every encouragement. I strongly recommend that he be placed next in order to Mr. C. Rangamna and above Mr. Sundaraj Iyengar and he be given Rs.105/- where he should be according to his service.

Mr. Ramaswamy Naidu was S.P.T. 2nd grade Veterinary Inspector since 1-1-25, and was drawing Rs.87/- on the 1st July 1928. He was entitled to a further increment on the 1st January 1929, but

but the Comptroller, as per objection Memo No.A.11.524 dated 17th January 1929 attached, insisted on his drawing only Rs.80/- from 1st July 1928. He is one of our exceptionally good men, and has completed a post-graduate course and under these circumstances he deserves better treatment. I, therefore, strongly recommend that he be given Rs.95/- with effect from 1st April 1929.

The case of Mr. C.K.Sreenivasa Iyengar, Assistant Superintendent, and B. Lakshmipathi, Offg. Superintendent, Amrit Mahal Department, are being represented separately so as not to hinder the allocation statement of Veterinary Inspectors being pushed through.

I send herewith a list recommending the order in which I think the Veterinary Inspectors, except Mr. Lakshmipathi, should be placed and the pay they should be allowed to draw from 1st April 1929, together with representations received from them.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant.

Sd/- R.W.Simpson Major.

Superintendent.

* * * * *

13.11.29
SVR.

" C O P Y "
* * * *

Appendix F G—1

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Section CV

File No. 55-29

Serial No. 2

No. S 5704/E

Diary No. of letter replied to.....4322

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *192*

To The Dir of Hyd.

Date of issue.....30/11/29

Signed by.....for Secy

Sir,

With reference to your letter No Roc 746 CV 198-28 of 13.11.29 submitting proposals for the allocation of Inspectors of the CV consequent on the reorganisation sanctioned in G.O. No 9982-10844 CV 50-28-5 of 30.3.29 I am directed to observe that the following variations in the relative ranks of Veterinary Inspectors are observed on comparing the list now sent up with the gradation list of the CV over

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

~~Gradation list received on 1.1.29 was sent to~~
~~the C.E.D in about June '29.~~
In the Gradation list, Mr Sundararajaperumal was shown
~~in the gradation list~~ above Mr C. Govindarao,
Mr T. Venkatachalam ~~was shown in the~~
~~gradation list~~ above Mr Ramaswami Naidu &
Mr V.S. Rajagopal Moor ~~was shown~~
above Mr C. Ramiendayar.

The list now sent up the order is reversed. ~~Why this~~ ~~is~~ ~~reversed~~ ~~has been this variation may be~~ ~~kindly explained~~ for this may be kindly explained

Mr S.R. Bapu (No 8 in the list now sent up) is shown as drawing Rs 104 p.m. under "present pay". This is not one of the Grade in the Scale of Rs 100-5-150 for 1st Grade Inspectors. The entry may be kindly ~~got~~ verified.

The list received with your letter under reply is herewith sent ~~returned~~ for reference & return.

I have it

20.11.29.

for Director

G. R. S. III—3]

ROUTINE NOTES.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record]

C V. 55-29-3

Telegraphic Address "Agri., Bangalore."
Code—5th Edition A. B. C.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
MYSORE STATE.

In reply please quote in full the Nos. and indicative symbol given below.

No. Roc. 746-C. V. 198 of 28-29. / Encs. 2.

BANGALORE,
10th January 1930.

FROM

LESLIE C. COLEMAN, ESQ., M.A., PH.D.,
DIRECTOR OF AGRICULTURE IN MYSORE,
BANGALORE.

5965

DEVELOPMENT BRANCH

To

N, Rama Rao, Esq., B.A., B.L.,

Secretary to the Government of Mysore,

Development Departments, Bangalore.

SIR,

Adverting to your letter D.5754/C.V.55-29-2 dated 30-11-29 regarding allocation of the Inspectors of the Civil Veterinary Department, I have the honour to forward herewith copy of letter No.8331 dated 14-12-29 from the Superintendent, Civil Veterinary Department, and to recommend that the proposal of the Superintendent which has my approval may be kindly sanctioned by Government at a very early date.

The enclosure received with your letter under advertence is returned herewith.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Director of Agriculture,

N. B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must do copied, or slips pasted on this form.

WD 1880—GPB—1,50,000—25-21

Letter No.8331 dated 13-12-29 from the Superintendent Civil Veterinary Department, Bangalore, to the Director of Agriculture in Mysore, Bangalore.

With reference to ~~xxxx~~ letter No.D.5704/C.V.55-29-2 dated 30-11-29 of the Secretary to the Government of Mysore, Development Departments, forwarded under your No. Roc. 746 of 28-29 dated 3-12-29 regarding the Variation in the ranks of certain Veterinary Inspectors, I have the honour to reiterate what I have already said in my letter No. ? - dated as regards Mr. Govinda Rao. Mr. C.V.Govinda Rao entered service as Veterinary Officer, Mysore Horse on 3-4-17 on a pay of Rs.75/- per mensem and has been practically on the same pay ever since. To make - matters ~~xxxx~~ worse, he was transferred to the Civil Veterinary Departmen just after Government had raised the scale of pay of the Veterinary Offi Mysore Horse, to Rs.100-10--150, thus being deprived, of this increment after years of service. Since his transfer to the Veterinary Department he has proved himself to be an officer of exceptional ability, with a special tact in dealing with ryots and overcoming opposition to inoculati He has the making of a good administrative officer and should be given every encouragement. He has hence been shown above Mr. M.Sundaraj Iyengar where he should be according to his service as the latter has entered service on 11-12-1918.

Mr. T.Venkatachalam is senior in service to Mr. M.Ramaswamy Naidu, but he lost this place through punishment vide No.1685-H.C.619-10 dated 16-10-23 of the DirectorofAgriculture. Mr.C.Nanjundiah should rightly be above Mr. V.S.Rajagopal Mudaliar as shown in the attached list as he is senior in service to Mr. Rajagopal Mudaliar. As regards the gradation list of the Civil Veterinary Department as it stood on 1st January 1929, ~~xxxx~~ unfortunately there was a discrepancy as regards the positions of Mr. Ramaswamy Naidu and Mr. T.Venkatachalam. They should stand as per G.O.No. D.3714-16-C.V.65-26-1, dated 26-9-1929, in which order they have been placed in the attached list. There is also a difference in the place of Mr T.Chandu. He was shown below Mr. Ramaswamy Naidu in the Government Order quoted above, but as he is senior in service, he has now been shown above Mr. Ramaswamy Naidu. On enquiring at the office of the chief conservator of Forests, information was obtained that Mr. Bapu has been drawing Rs. 116/- from 1-6-1929 in the grade of Rs.100-8/1-140, and therefore he is drawing more pay than his two seniors, who now have the right to demand ~~xxxx~~ pay. I have already recommended [illegible]

who is one of Mr. Bapu's seniors to Rs.125/- and I now recommend Mr.N.R.Sreenivasa Iyengar who is Mr. Bapu's other senior for Rs.120/-

****

"Copy"

Director of Agriculture.

KLGM

C. V. 55-29-4

WD A1844--GPB--1,000--12-3-18

Telegraphic Address
"Agri., Bangalore."

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
MYSORE STATE.

Bangalore,

10th. January.....1930.

No. Roc.746-C.V.198/28-29.

FROM

LESLIE C. COLEMAN, ESQ., M.A., PH.D.,

DIRECTOR OF AGRICULTURE IN MYSORE,

BANGALORE.

To

N.Rama Rao,Esq.,B.A.,B.L.,

Secretary to the Government of Mysore,

Development Departments, Bangalore.

SIR,

With reference to the concluding para of my letter No. Roc. 746-C.V.198 of 28-29 dated 13-11-29 regarding representation of Messrs.C.K.Sreenivas Iyengar, Assistant Superintendent Civil - Veterinary Department and B.Lakshmipathy, Offg. Superintendent of Amritmahal Department, I have the honour to forward herewith copy of letter No.7854 dated 5-12-29 from the Superintendent Civil veterinary Department, and to state that I agree with the recommendation of the Superintendent that both these officers may be graded as Assistant Superintendents and given Rs.200 in the grade Rs.150-10-200, and that Mr. Lakshmipathi be placed below Mr.K.Krishna Iyengar,Mr.Srinivasa Iyengar taking rank next to Mr. Lakshmipathi.

I request you to be so good as to obtain early orders of Government accordingly.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Director of Agriculture,

KLM.

Letter No.7854 dated 3rd December 1929, from the Superintendent Civil Veterinary Department to the DirectorofAgriculture In mysore, Bangalore.

In forwarding herewith the representations of Mr. C.K.Srinivasa Iyengar, Assistant Superintendent, Civil Veterinary Department, and Mr. B.Lakshmipathi Officiating Superintendent, Amrith Mahal Department, I have the honour to state that due consideration was not shown to these officers in fixing their pay and positions in the grade of the Civil Veterinary Department, Vide Government Order No.D.3714-16.C.V. 65 -26-17 dated 26th September 1928. In my original recommendation I proposed that Mr B.Lakshmipathi should be graded as an Assistant Superintendent on Rs.200/- per mensem and placed next to Mr. K.Krishna Krishna Iyengar in order of seniority, but instead, hewas placed 19th on the list, ~~along~~ among the 2nd grade Veterinary Inspectors. This was most discouraging to a man who had proved himself to be a thoroughly capable administrative Officer. He has a thorough knowledge of his professional work, having had exceptional opportunity of studying the latest methods of preventive treatment. He has also shown great ability in organisation and management at the Hebbal Agricultural and the Rayankere Dairy Farms, and also as officiating Superintendent Amrith Mahal Department. He is very highly thought of by all who have come in contact with him. Under the circumstances it is most unfair and discouraging for an able officer like Mr. B.Lakshmipathi, who has proved himself to be a most efficient and capable administrative officer to be classed as a veterinary Inspector I therefore, strongly recommend that he be graded as an Assistant Superintendent, andplaced next in order to Mr. K.Krishniengar on Rs.200/- per mensem, as I consider him superior to the other Assistant Superintendents in the Department and fit to be in independent charge.

In Mr. C.K.Srinivasa Iyengar's case, I would like to represent that in the original statement submitted, he was recommended for Rs.200/- and to beplaced below Mr. M.Swami Rao and above Mr. K.N. Srinivasan, but instead he has been given Rs.150/- and placed below Mr. Srinivasan in G.O.No.D.3714-16-C.V.65-26-17 dated 26th September 1928. Mr. C.K.Srinivasa Iyengar was appointed as Assistant Superintendent as far back as 1918, and he had one increment before he reverted to the Kunigal Stud Farm. If he had been left undisturbed, he would now be the most senior Assistant Superintendent and would have drawn the maximum salary of Rs.200/- five years ago. He having lost touch with the

with the Civil, Veterinary Department for eight years and as the work had already altered completely since he left it, I did not think it advisable to recommend that he should be the most senior Assistant Superintendent, though he is entitled to this rank from his length of service. Since his reappointment as Assistant Superintendent, he has picked up the work of the Department and has given satisfaction. He thinks nothing of pulling off his coat and helping Veterinary Inspectors in serious operations and in inoculating animals. His only fault is that he is not firm enough with his subordinates. I strongly recommend that he be given Rs.200/- with effect from 1st July 1929, and placed next to Mr. Lakshmipathi, and above Mr. M.Swami Rao in the order of seniority.

****

"C O P Y"

Director of Agriculture.

Mdy.

Appendix F G—1

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Section CW

File No. 55.29.

Serial No. 5

No. 13000/Vol 8

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193*

To The Director of Agriculture

Date of issue 23/5/30

Signed by Mr C.S. Nowbery

Sir,

With reference to Correspondence ending with your letter No R.C 746-CW 198/28-29 of 10.1.30. regarding the allocation of the Inspectors of the C.W.D. I am directed to request You to be so good as to furnish very early a revised ~~Statement~~ one in accordance with the principles enunciated below:—

1) for one to four years of Service

over

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

- 31.3.29 our present pay
- one increment only to be allowed.

(4) For four years or more of such service 2 increments

(3) For less than one year of service
no increment; but the period during
which present pay is drawn will
count for next increment — This
privilege however not being
admissible to those entitled to
the Concession specified in (4) below.

(4) Where the pay plus the increment
on the above basis does not form
the stage of the next progressive
Scale the next stage of increment
in the Scale should be given.

Can to add that certain discrepancies noticed in your statement as regards the premia pay etc of some of the officers have been corrected in detail

I have &c

16/5/30

for Secy. Govt

Ex C

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE,

General and Revenue Secretariat

Dated, Bangalore, 2 2 [illegible]

No.

From

N. RAMA RAO, Esq., B. A., B. L.,
Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore
Development Departments.

To

The Director of Agriculture

in Mysore, Bangalore.

Sir,

With reference to correspondence ending with your letter No. Roc.746.C.V.198/28-29 dated 10th January 1930 regarding the allocation of the Inspectors of the Civil Veterinary Department, I am directed to return herewith the allocation statement received from you and to request you to be so good as to furnish very early a revised one in accordance with the principles enunciated below:

(1) For one to four years of service up to ~~31st~~ 30th March 1929 on present pay one increment only to be allowed.

(2) For four years or more of such service- 2 increments.

(3) For less than one year of service no increment but the period during which present pay is drawn will count for next increment- this privilege however not being admissible to those entitled to the concession specified in (4) below:

(4) Where the pay plus increment on the above basis does not form ~~the~~ a stage of the ~~next~~ new progressive scale, the next stage of increment in the scale should be given.

I am to add that certain discrepancies noticed in your statement as regards the present pay etc., of some of the officers have been corrected in pencil.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

[signature]
21/5

For Secretary to Government,
Development Departments.

2 TSS 21-5

Telegraphic Address "Agri., Bangalore."
Code 4th Edition A. B. C.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
MYSORE STATE.

10992
BANGALORE BRANCH

Immediate.

In reply please quote in full the Nos. and indicative symbol given below.

Roc. 746-Est. of ~~29-30.~~ 98 29

June 21, 1930.

FROM

LESLIE C. COLEMAN, ESQ., M.A., PH.D.,
DIRECTOR OF AGRICULTURE IN MYSORE,
BANGALORE.

C.V. 55-29-6

To

N. Rama Rao, Esq.,B.A.,B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
Development Departments, Bangalore.

SIR,

With reference to your letter No.D.13000/C.V.55-29-5, dated 23-5-1930 regarding the allocation of Veterinary Inspectors, I have the honour to forward herewith a copy of letter No.18507 - dated 8/10-6-1930 from the Superintendent, Civil Veterinary Department along with the revised statement submitted by him. There are certain deviations from the principles ~~communicated~~ enunciated by you for the preparation of the statement which, in view of the representation made by the Superintendent that a rigid adherence to these principles would involve hardship in some cases, I recommend may be kindly sanctioned.

I request that early orders of Government on the allocation may be kindly obtained at a very early date so that the amount proposed to meet the extra cost involved during the current year may not lapse.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Director of Agriculture.

dsr(3)

Letter No.18507 dated 10th June 1930 from the Superintendent, Civil Veterinary Department, Bangalore, to the Director of Agriculture in Mysore, Bangalore.

With reference to letter No.D.13000/C.V.55-29-5 dated 23-5-1930 of the Secretary to the Goverment of Mysore, Development Departments, forwarded under your No.Roc. 746/29-30 dated 26-5-30 regarding the Allocation of the Veterinary Inspectors, I have the honour to forward herewith a revised statement in duplicate and to state that the statement prepared as it is on the lines specified by the Development Secretary gives room to certain anamolies in that it deprives some of the senior Inspectors of an increment on the new scale, which they would have been entitled to draw had they not been given the last increment on the old scale.

Mr.N.R.Srinivasa Iyengar was promoted to Rs. 97/- on 1-7-23 and continued to draw this pay till 13-7-1926 when he was promoted to Rs. 99/- and after a year earned the next increment of Re.1/- on the old scale on 13-7-27. As per Development Secretary's letter, he is entitled to only one increment which fixes his pay at Rs. 105/- whereas Messrs. G.Subramanier and L.V.Shallam Iyengar who are junior to Mr.Srinivasa Iyengar are entitled to two increments, which fixes their pay at Rs. 110/- having remained on the same pay for more than four years. Then again Mr.S.R.Bapu, who is in the Forest Department, and who is junior to Mr.Srinivasa Iyengar is drawing Rs. 124/- in the grade 100-8-140/-. Mr.Srinivasa Iyengar is therefore recommended for Rs.120/-.

The cases of Messrs. C.Ranganna and M.Sundararaj Iyengar are similar. In the case of Mr.C.V.Govinda Rao, I have but to reiterate that his transfer to this Department from the Military just at the time when the scale of pay of the Veterinary Officer, Mysore Horse, was raised to Rs. 100-10-150/- has placed him at a serious disadvantage in that it has deprived him of this promotion after years of service.

As regards Mr. K. Ramaswamy Naidu, he was S.P.T. in the second grade drawing Rs. 72/- from 26-4-25 and with the annual increments, he would have been entitled to draw Rs. 92/- on 30-3-1929, but on the new scale he is entitled to draw only Rs.80/-. But in the case

of

of Messrs. M.R.Kenchiah and T. Chandu who are senior to Mr. Ramaswamy Naidu they are entitled to draw Rs. 85/- on the new scale.

As there are a few other instances where the pay of the senior men happen to be less than that of their juniors, I propose that in such cases they be given the same pay that their juniors are entitled to draw.

I request that sanction of Government may kindly be obtained early, as otherwise the amount proposed to meet the extra cost during the current year, will lapse. If however orders are not issued in time to enable the Inspectors to draw their pay on the new scale before the end of the current official year, I request that Government may kindly be moved to provide the requisite sum for this purpose in the next year's budget of this Department.

****

"COPY"

Director of Agriculture.

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 192 .

Date of issue 3/3/32

Signed by ...

May this be

i Printed?

ii treated as a standing order ?

iii published in the Gazette, English Part ?

iv translated ?

v placed at the disposal of the press ?

vi published in the Gazette, Kannada Part ?

Sec CU 55-29

File No. ~~55~~ 29

Serial No. 7

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

Read – f.o. No D 9982 - 100 44/CU 50-28-5 & 30.3.29/30 Sanctioning a Uniform time Scale of Rs 60-5-150 with dy efficiency bar at Rs 120/- for the inspectors of the Vety Dept and stating that the revised Scale will come into force immediately the starting pay of the incumbents being fixed in strict accordance with MSR

Order Thereon No

2 Correspondence ending with letter No Roc 746-Ecl & 21/6/30 from the Dir: of Agriculture Submitting proposals for the allocation of the inspectors in the new time Scale referred to in the f.o. read above.

Ords no L 2620-21 & 3/9/30

Govt are pleased to order
the allocation of Vety Inspectors
in the revd time Scale
as per Statement attached
with effect from the 30th March 29.

Four offrs to Veh under Govt

Rev. 26/8

CE 27/8/30

Forests to Govt
Rev Dept

The Dir of Agriculture
The Comptroller to Govt thro Fd.

List of enclosure.

Copied by

Examined by

WD 079—GPB—8000—10-10-29

Statement showing the pay of the Deputy Collectors in the revised grade, strictly admissible under the Mysore Civil Regulation.

Name	present pay Rs	pay as per M.S.R. Rs.	Remarks
1. Mr B. V. Venkatachar			DDO Asst Supdt Mysore Camp
2. " R. M. Patankar	100/-	100/-	
3. " C. Narayan Iyengar	140/-	140/-	
4. " N. Krishniengar	100/-	100/-	
5. " S. D. Achar			DDO. Asst Supdt Seringapatam
6. " Vacant as per G.O. No. D.			
7. " N. R. Srinivasa Iyengar	100/-	100/-	
8. " S. R. Bapu	108/-	108/- on 1/3/29. Forest Deptt (100-8-140)	
9 " G. Subramanie	97/-	95+2	
10. " L. V. Shellam Iyengar	97/-	95+2	
11 " C. V. Govinda Rao	82/-	80+2	
12. " C. Ranganna	97/-	95+2	
13. " M. Sundaraj Iyengar	97/-	95+2	
14. " B. Laxmipathy			DDO. Supdt Amrith Mahal Dpn
15. " P. C. Nayar			DDO Asst Supdt Seringapatam
16 " K. Ranganatha Rao			—— Do ——
17. N. Krishna Murthy	87/-	85+2	
18. M. R. Kenchiah	72/-	70+2	
19. T. Chandra	72/-	70+2	
20. M. Ramaswamy Naidu	72/-	70+2	
21. T. V. Venkatachalam	72/-	70+2	
22. G. S. Bhubhakar	72/-	70+2	
23. H. B. Kulkarni	72/-	70+2	
24. P. K. Rama Rao	72/-	70+2	
25. K. N. Kailasam	72/-	70+2	
26. B. Sheik Peer	72/-	70+2	
27. T. Aswath Sastry	72/-	70+2	

	Rs	Rs
28. Mr. P. S. Shama Rao	80/-	80/-
29. " G. V. Ramiah	72/-	70+2
30. " C. Nanjundiah	72/-	70+2
31 " V. S. Rajagopal Mudaliar	72/-	70+2
32. " G. Narayan Murthy	72/-	70+2
33. " K. Srikantiah	72/-	70+2
34. " V. Jagannath	72/-	70+2
35 " S. Kalyan Sundaram	60/-	60
36 " M. Subba Rao	67/-	65+2
37. " B. Venkatesiah	67/-	65+2
38. " B. Somasundaram Pillay	67/-	65+2
39. " M. Srikantiah	67/-	65+2
40. " Syed Nurudin	67/-	65+2
41. K. Krishna Murthy	67/-	65+2
42. N. Narayan Rao	67/-	65+2
43. P. A. Abdul Kalam	67/-	65+2
44. V. S. Kuppusamy Mudaliar	67/-	65+2
45. R. M. Ponnosham Naidu	67/-	65+2
46. K. R. Ramachandra Rao	62/-	60+2
47. K. S. Gopal Rao	60/-	60
48 H. N. Doraswamy Iyengar	60/-	60
49. N. Sheshagiri Rao	60/-	60
50. K. J. Subramanyam	60/-	60
51. S. S. K. Iyengar	60/-	60
52. S. M. Pantambekar	60/-	60
53. Syed Hashim	60/-	60
54. S. M. Abdul Wahid	60/-	60
55. Syed Yusuf	60/-	60
56. G. Zachariah	60/-	60

			Rs	Rs
57.	Mr.	D. N. Vasudeva Mudaliar	60/-	60
58.	"	S. Parthasarathy	60/-	60
59.	"	G. N. Sankaraiah	60/-	60
60	"	J.P. Wesley	60/-	60
61	"	S. Rama Krishnan	60/-	60
62	"	L. Gurumurthy	60/-	60
63	"	H. Bandish	60/-	60
64	"	R. Sadasivaramanujam	60/-	60
65.	"	P. K. Nair.	60/-	60

HHO
6/8/30.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

Read:—

Government Order No. D 9982-10044/C.V. 50-28-5 dated 30th March 1929 sanctioning a uniform time scale of Rs.60-5-150 with an efficiency bar at Rs.120/- for the inspectors of the Veterinary Department and stating that the revised scale will come into force immediately, the starting pay of the incumbents being fixed in strict accordance with Mysore Service Regulations.

2. Correspondence ending with letter No. Agc 746-Est dated 21st June 1930 from the Director of Agriculture submitting proposals for the allocation of the Inspectors in the new time scale referred to in the Government order read above.

ORDER No. D. 16 21-21/Fin dated, Bangalore. 5/7/30

C.V. 50-28-5

Government are pleased to order the allocation of the Veterinary Inspectors in the new time scale as per statement attached with effect from the 30th March 1929.

For Secretary to Government,
Development Departments.

To

The Director of Agriculture in Mysore.
The Comptroller to Government through Financial Department.

5BSI/1-9

Statement showing the pr[illegible] of [illegible] Inspectors in the revised grade, strictly admissible under the Mysore Service Regulation.

Name	Present pay	Pay as per M.S.R.		Remarks.
	Rs	Rs		
1. Mr. K.V. Venkatachar				C.F.O. Asst.Supdt Mysore Annexe.
2. ,, [illegible].M. Patankar	100	100		
3. ,, C. Narayan Iyengar	140	140		
4. ,, V. Krishna Iyengar	1[illegible]	1[illegible]0		
5. ,, [illegible]. Achar				C.F. Asst.Supdt
6. ,, Vacant as per G.O. No. [illegible]				
7. ,, V. [illegible] Srinivasa Iyengar	1[illegible]0	100		
8. ,, [illegible]. Rao.	1[illegible]8	1[illegible]8		Forest Asst (100-8-140)
9. ,, G. Subramanier	97	95	2	
10. ,, M.V. Challam Iyengar	97	95	2	
11. ,, C.V. Govinda Rao	9[illegible]	90	[illegible]	
12. ,, C. [illegible]angappa	97	95	2	
13. ,, [illegible].Nanjaraja Iyengar	97	95	2	
14. ,, [illegible]. Rakhmipathi				C.F. Asst.Supdt Arithmetical Work.
15. ,, [illegible].V. Nayar				C.F. Asst. Supt
16. ,, K. [illegible]Nagendra Rao				To
17. M.Krishnamurthi	87	85	2	
18. ,, M. [illegible]. Kenchiah	72	70	2	
19. [illegible]. Chandy.	72	70	2	
20. ,, [illegible]. Ramaswamy Naidu.	72	70	2	
21. ,, T.V. Venkatachalam	72	70	2	
22. ,, C.[illegible]. Prabhakar	72	70	2	
23. ,, [illegible]. Subbarai	72	70	2	
24. ,, [illegible]. Shamanna	72	70	2	
25. [illegible]. Nallaswamy	72	70	2	
26. ,, [illegible]. Sheik Peer	72	70	2	
27. ,, [illegible]. Gopinath Poddar	72	70	2	
28. ,, [illegible]. Shamanna	80	80		
29. ,, [illegible]. Ramiah	72	70	2	
30. ,, C. Nanjundiah	72	70	2	

31.	Mr. [illegible] ajagopala Mudaliyar.	72	70	2
32.	.. [illegible] Narayana Murthy	72	70	2
33.	.. [illegible] rikrishnaiah	72	70	2
34.	.. [illegible] Jagannath	70	70	
35.	.. [illegible] ariyamundaram	60	60	
36.	.. [illegible]	67	65	2
37.	.. [illegible]	67	65	2
38.	.. [illegible] Ramasundaram Pillay.	67	65	2
39.	.. [illegible] Krishnaiah	67	65	2
40.	.. [illegible] Syed Nurudin	67	65	2
41.	.. [illegible] Krishna murthy	67	65	2
42.	.. [illegible] Narayana Rao	67	65	2
43.	.. [illegible]	67	65	2
44.	.. [illegible]	67	65	2
45.	.. [illegible]	67	65	2
46.	.. [illegible]	62	60	2
47.	.. [illegible]	60	60	
48.	.. [illegible]	60	60	
49.	.. [illegible]	60	60	
50.	.. [illegible]	60	60	
51.	.. [illegible]	60	60	
52.	.. [illegible]	60	60	
53.	.. [illegible]	60	60	
54.	.. [illegible]	60	60	
55.	.. [illegible]	60	60	
56.	.. [illegible]	60	60	
57.	.. [illegible]	60	60	
58.	.. [illegible]	60	60	
59.	.. [illegible]	60	60	
60.	.. [illegible]	60	60	
61.	.. [illegible]	60	60	
62.	.. [illegible]	60	60	
63.	.. [illegible]	60	60	
64.	.. [illegible]	60	60	
65.	.. [illegible]	60	60	

"COPY"

[illegible]

for Secretary to Government,

Development Department.

BMSI/1-9